



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,192	10/11/2000	Anders Johnson	108339-00031	5268

32294 7590 01/05/2005

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

HA, LEYNNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Applicati n No.

09/685,192

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON, ANDERS

Examin r

LEYNNA T. HA

Art Unit

2135

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: N/A.Claim(s) objected to: N/A.Claim(s) rejected: 1-25 and 27-29.Claim(s) ^{cancel} withdrawn from consideration: 26.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amended claims will not be considered or entered because it was introduced after the Final rejection dated December 13, 2004. The claims previous to the Final rejection will only be considered and discussed in regards to its limitations and subject matter. Therefore claims 1-25 and 27-29 remains rejected in view of Tello and the following arguments was previously discussed in the Final office action:

Applicant argues that Tello fails to disclose a host wherein the functions of the host is to determine the identification number associated with the component/network switch through the communication with the non-volatile memory via the interface. However, claim 1 only claims "a host in communication with the identification module" and the guess register. Whatever Applicant argues the definition may be for a host, Applicant's host is broad and was not claimed in more details. Hence, the Examiner interprets to the broadest reasonable definition wherein a "host" is known in the art could be a main computer in a mainframe or the computer to which terminals are connected or a computer that provides access to other computers. Tello discloses a host is the computer with the security engine that gives access to other computer systems (col.14, lines 46-61 and col.17, lines 15-67). The bit strings are disclosed (col.15, lines 52-65 and col.16, lines 13-26). Tello discloses a "function enable output" by discussing a slave computer or subordinate computer that includes hashing and only the one identification code identifying the slave card and the ability to communicate with other computers (col.19, lines 12-25 and col.37, lines 27-42). The claimed language merely reads on acquiring a passcode where it does not read what Applicant argues as a passcode transmitted by the manufacturer and same goes for the argument concerning the hash numbers.

The Examiner is only required to read what is claimed in claims 1-25 and 27-29 and gives the claim language the broadest reasonable interpretation.



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100